Generalizations of Tucker–Fan–Shashkin lemmas

Oleg R. Musin*

arXiv:1409.8637v5 [math.CO] 25 Apr 2016

Abstract

Tucker and Ky Fan's lemma are combinatorial analogs of the Borsuk–Ulam theorem (BUT). In 1996, Yu. A. Shashkin proved a version of Fan's lemma, which is a combinatorial analog of the odd mapping theorem (OMT). We consider generalizations of these lemmas for BUT–manifolds, i.e. for manifolds that satisfy BUT. Proofs rely on a generalization of the OMT and on a lemma about the doubling of manifolds with boundaries that are BUT–manifolds.

Keywords: Tucker lemma, Ky Fan lemma, Shashkin lemma, Borsuk–Ulam theorem, degree of mapping.

1 Tucker's, Fan's and Shashkin's lemmas

Throughout this paper the symbol $\mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the Euclidean space of dimension d. We denote by $\mathbb{B}^d$ the d-dimensional unit ball and by $\mathbb{S}^d$ the d-dimensional unit sphere. If we consider $\mathbb{S}^d$ as the set of unit vectors x in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, then points x and $-x$ are called *antipodal* and the symmetry given by the mapping $x \to -x$ is called the *antipodality* on $\mathbb{S}^d$.

1.1 Tucker and Fan's lemma

Let T be a triangulation of the d-dimensional ball $\mathbb{B}^d$. We call T *antipodally symmetric on the boundary* if the set of simplices of T contained in the boundary of $\mathbb{B}^d = \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is an antipodally symmetric triangulation of $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$; that is if $s \subset \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is a simplex of T, then $-s$ is also a simplex of T.

Tucker's lemma [16] *Let T be a triangulation of $\mathbb{B}^d$ that is antipodally symmetric on the boundary. Let*

$$L : V(T) \to \{+1, -1, +2, -2, \dots, +d, -d\}$$

be a labelling of the vertices of T that is antipodal (i. e. $L(-v) = -L(v)$) for every vertex v on the boundary. Then there exists an edge in T that is **complementary***, i.e. its two vertices are labelled by opposite numbers.*



Figure 1: Illustration of Tucker's lemma

There is also a version of Tucker's lemma for spheres:

Spherical Tucker's lemma. *Let T be a centrally symmetric triangulation of the sphere $\mathbb{S}^d$. Let*

$$L : V(T) \to \{+1, -1, +2, -2, \ldots, +d, -d\}$$

be an antipodal labelling. Then there exists a complementary edge.

Tucker's lemma was extended by Ky Fan [3]:

Ky Fan's lemma. *Let T be a centrally symmetric triangulation of the sphere $\mathbb{S}^d$. Suppose that each vertex v of T is assigned a label $L(v)$ from $\{\pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots, \pm n\}$ in such a way that $L(-v) = -L(v)$. Suppose this labelling does not have complementary edges. Then there are an odd number of d-simplices of T whose labels are of the form $\{k_0, -k_1, k_2, \ldots, (-1)^d k_d\}$, where $1 \le k_0 < k_1 < \ldots < k_d \le n$. In particular, $n \ge d + 1$.*

1.2 Shashkin's lemma

In the 1990's, Yu. A. Shashkin published several works related to discrete versions of classic fixed point theorems [10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. In [13] he proved the following theorem:

Shashkin's lemma. *Let T be a triangulation of a planar polygon that is antipodally symmetric on the boundary. Let*

$$L : V(T) \to \{+1, -1, +2, -2, +3, -3\}$$

be a labelling of the vertices of T that satisfies $L(-v) = -L(v)$ for every vertex v on the boundary. Suppose that this labelling does not have complementary edges. Then for any numbers a, b, c, where $|a| = 1$, $|b| = 2$, $|c| = 3$, the total number of triangles in T with labels (a, b, c) and $(-a, -b, -c)$ is odd.

*This research is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1400876 and the RFBR grant 15-01-99563.



Figure 2: Illustration of Shashkin's lemma.

Remark. In other words, Shashkin proved that if $(a, b, c) = (1, 2, 3)$, $(1, -2, 3)$, $(1, 2, -3)$ and $(1, -2, -3)$, then the number of triangles with labels (a, b, c) or $(-a, -b, -c)$ is odd. Denote this number by $\mathrm{SN}(a, b, c)$. Then in Fig. 2 we have

$$\mathrm{SN}(1, 2, 3) = 3,\ \mathrm{SN}(1, -2, 3) = 1,\ \mathrm{SN}(1, 2, -3) = 3,\ \mathrm{SN}(1, -2, -3) = 3.$$

Note that this result was published only in Russian and only for two–dimensional case. Moreover, Shashkin attributes this theorem to Ky Fan [3].

Actually, Shashkin's lemma can be derived from Ky Fan's lemma for $n = d+1$. However. Shashkin's proof is different and relies on the odd mapping theorem (OMT). In fact, this lemma is a discrete version of the OMT. That is why we distinguish this result as *Shashkin's lemma*.

The following is a spherical version of Shashkin's lemma.

Spherical Shashkin's lemma. *Let T be a centrally symmetric triangulation of $\mathbb{S}^d$. Let*

$$L : V(T) \to \Pi_{d+1} := \{+1, -1, +2, -2, \ldots, +(d+1), -(d+1)\}$$

be an antipodal labelling of T. Suppose that this labelling does not have complementary edges. Then for any set of labels $\Lambda := \{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_{d+1}\} \subset \Pi_{d+1}$ with $|\ell_i| = i$ for all i, the number of d–simplices in T that are labelled by Λ is odd.

1.3 Main results

In [7] we invented BUT (Borsuk–Ulam Type) – manifolds. Theorems 3.1–3.4 in this paper extend Tucker's and Shashkin's lemmas for BUT–manifolds. Namely, Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 are extensions of the spherical Tucker and Shahskin lemmas, where $\mathbb{S}^d$ is substituted by a BUT–manifold. Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 are extensions of the original Tucker and Shashkin lemmas, where $\mathbb{B}^d$ is substituted by a manifold M with boundary ∂M that is a BUT–manifold.

Our proof of Theorem 3.2 is relies on a generalization of the odd mapping theorem for BUT–manifolds:

Theorem 2.1. *Let (M_1, A_1) and (M_2, A_2) be BUT–manifolds. Then any odd continuous mapping $f : M_1 \to M_2$ has odd degree.*

Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 follow from Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 by using Lemma 3.1, which is about the doubling of manifolds with boundaries that are BUT–manifolds.

In Section 4 we extend for BUT–manifolds Shaskin's proof of two Tucker's theorems about covering families from [16]. Actually, these theorems are corollaries of Theorem 3.2.

2 The odd mapping theorem

We say that a mapping $f : \mathbb{S}^d \to \mathbb{S}^d$ is *odd* or *antipodal* if $f(-x) = -f(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{S}^d$. If f is a continuous mapping, then $\deg f$ (the degree of f) is well defined.

Let $f : M_1 \to M_2$ be a continuous map between two closed manifolds M_1 and M_2 of the same dimension. The degree is a number that represents the amount of times that the domain manifold wraps around the range manifold under the mapping. Then $\deg_2(f)$ (the degree modulo 2) is 1 if this number is odd and 0 otherwise. It is well known that $\deg_2(f)$ of a continuous map f is a homotopy invariant (see [6]).

The classical **odd mapping theorem** states that

Every continuous odd mapping $f : \mathbb{S}^d \to \mathbb{S}^d$ has odd degree.

Shashkin [13] (see also [5, Proposition 2.4.1]) gives a proof of this theorem for simplicial mappings $f : \mathbb{S}^d \to \mathbb{S}^d$. Conner and Floyd [2] considered Theorem 2.1 for a wide class of spaces. Here we extend the odd mapping theorem for BUT–manifolds. In our paper [7], we extended the Borsuk–Ulam theorem for manifolds.

Let M be a connected compact PL (piece-wise linear) d-dimensional manifold without boundary with a free simplicial involution $A : M \to M$, i. e. $A^2(x) = A(A(x)) = x$ and $A(x) \neq x$. We say that a pair (M, A) is a *BUT (Borsuk-Ulam Type) manifold* if for any continuous $g : M \to \mathbb{R}^d$ there is a point $x \in M$ such that $g(A(x)) = g(x)$. Equivalently, if a continuous map $f : M \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is antipodal, i.e. $f(A(x)) = -f(x)$, then the set of zeros $Z_f := f^{-1}(0)$ is not empty.

In [7], we found several equivalent necessary and sufficient conditions for manifolds to be BUT. In particular,

M is a d–dimensional BUT–manifold if and only if M admits an antipodal continuous transversal to zeros mapping $h : M \to \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|Z_h| = 2 \pmod 4$.

A continuous mapping $h : M \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is called *transversal to zero* if there is an open set U in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that U contains 0, U is homeomorphic to the open d-ball and $h^{-1}(U)$ consists of a finite number open sets in M that are homeomorphic to open d-balls.

The class of BUT–manifolds is sufficiently large. It is clear that $(\mathbb{S}^d, A)$ with $A(x) = -x$ is a BUT-manifold. Suppose that M can be represented as a connected sum $N \# N$,

where N is a closed PL manifold. Then M admits a free involution. Indeed, M can be "centrally symmetrically" embedded to $\mathbb{R}^k$, for some k, and the antipodal symmetry $x \to -x$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$ implies a free involution $A : M \to M$ [7, Corollary 1]. For instance, orientable two-dimensional manifolds M^2_g with even genus g and non-orientable manifolds P^2_m with even m, where m is the number of Möbius bands, are BUT-manifolds.

Let M_i, $i = 1, 2$, be a manifold with a free involution A_i. We say that a mapping $f : M_1 \to M_2$ is *antipodal* (or *odd*, or *equivariant*) if $f(A_1(x)) = A_2(f(x))$ for all $x \in M_1$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let (M_1, A_1) and (M_2, A_2) be d-dimensional BUT–manifolds. Then any odd continuous mapping $f : M_1 \to M_2$ has odd degree.*

Proof. Since (M_2, A_2) is BUT, there is a continuous antipodal transversal to zeros mapping $g : M_2 \to \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|Z_g| = 4m_2 + 2$ [7, Theorem 2].

Let $h := g \circ f$. Then $h : M_1 \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is continuous and antipodal. Since the degree of a mapping is a homotopy invariant, without loss of generality we may assume that h is a transversal to zero mapping (see [7, Lemma 3]). Therefore $|Z_h| = 4m_1 + 2$. On the other hand,

$$|Z_h| = \sum_{x \in Z_g} |f^{-1}(x)|.$$

Then

$$2m_1 + 1 = (2m_2 + 1) \deg_2 f \pmod 2.$$

Thus, the degree of f is odd. □

3 Tucker's and Shashkin's lemmas for BUT–manifolds

In our papers [7, 8, 9] are considered extensions of Tucker's lemma. Here we consider generalizations of Tucker's and Shashkin's lemmas for manifolds with and without boundaries.

Let T be an *antipodally symmetric* (or *antipodal*) triangulation of a BUT–manifold (M, A). This means that $A : T \to T$ sends simplices to simplices. Denote by Π_n the set of labels $\{+1, -1, +2, -2, \ldots, +n, -n\}$ and let $L : V(T) \to \Pi_n$ be a labeling of T. We say that this labelling is *antipodal* if $L(A(v)) = -L(v)$. An edge uv in T is called *complementary* if $L(u) = -L(v)$.

Theorem 3.1. ([8, Theorem 4.1]) *Let (M, A) be a d-dimensional BUT–manifold. Let T be an antipodal triangulation of M. Then for any antipodal labelling $L : V(T) \to \Pi_d$ there exists a complementary edge.*

Any antipodal labelling $L : V(T) \to \Pi_n$ of an antipodally symmetric triangulation T of M defines a simplicial map $f_L : T \to \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\{e_1, -e_1, e_2, -e_2, \ldots, e_n, -e_n\}$ be the standard orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For $v \in V(T)$, set $f_L(v) := e_i$ if $L(v) = i$ and $f_L(v) := -e_i$ if $L(v) = -i$. Since f_L is defined on $V(T)$, it defines a simplicial mapping $f_L : T \to \mathbb{R}^n$ (See details in [5, Sec. 2.3].)

The following theorem is a version of Shashkin's lemma for manifolds without boundary.

Theorem 3.2. *Let (M, A) be a d-dimensional BUT–manifold. Let T be an antipodally symmetric triangulation of M. Let $L : V(T) \to \Pi_{d+1}$ be an antipodal labelling of T. Suppose that this labelling does not have complementary edges. Then for any set of labels $\Lambda := \{\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_{d+1}\} \subset \Pi_{d+1}$ with $|\ell_i| = i$ for all i, the number of d–simplices in T that are labelled by Λ is odd.*

Proof. Since L has no complimentary edges, $f_L : T \to \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is an antipodal mapping of M to the boundary of the crosspolytope C^{d+1} that is the convex hull $\operatorname{conv}\{e_1, -e_1, \dots, e_{d+1}, -e_{d+1}\}$. Note that ∂C^{d+1} is a simplicial sphere $\mathbb{S}^d$, which is a BUT-manifold. Therefore, Theorem 2.2 implies that the number of preimages of the simplex in ∂C^{d+1} with indexes from Λ is odd. It completes the proof. □

Remark. Theorem 3.1 can be proved using the same arguments. Indeed, suppose that $L : V(T) \to \Pi_d$ has no complementary edges. Then f_L sends M to ∂C^d. Since $\dim \partial C^d = d - 1$, $\deg f_L = 0$. This contradicts Theorem 2.1.

Now we extend Tucker's and Shashkin's lemmas for the case when M is a manifold with boundary that is a BUT–manifold. But first, prove that there exists a "double" of M that is a BUT-manifold.

Lemma 3.1. *Let M be a compact PL manifold with boundary ∂M. Suppose $(\partial M, A)$ is a BUT–manifold. Then there is a BUT–manifold $(\tilde{M}, \tilde{A})$ and a submanifold N in $\tilde{M}$ such that $N \simeq M$, $\tilde{A}|_{\partial N} \simeq A$, $(N \setminus \partial N) \cap \tilde{A}(N \setminus \partial N) = \emptyset$ and*

$$\tilde{M} \simeq (N \setminus \partial N) \cup \partial N \cup \tilde{A}(N \setminus \partial N).$$

Proof. **1.** First we prove the following statement:
Let X be a finite simplicial complex. Let Y be a subcomplex of X with a free involution $A : Y \to Y$. Then there is a simplicial embedding F of X into $\mathbb{R}^q_+ := \{(x_1, \dots, x_q) \in \mathbb{R}^q : x_1 \geq 0\}$, where q is sufficiently large, such that Y is centrally symmetrically embedded in $\mathbb{R}^q$, i.e. $F(A(y)) = -F(y)$ for all $y \in Y$, and $X \setminus Y$ is mapped into the interior of $\mathbb{R}^q_+$.

Indeed, let $v_1, v_{-1}, \dots, v_m, v_{-m}$ denote vertices of Y such that $A(v_k) = v_{-k}$. Let $\{v_{m+1}, \dots, v_n\}$ be the set of vertices of $X \setminus Y$.

Denote by C^n the n–dimensional crosspolytope that is the boundary of convex hull

$$\operatorname{conv}\{e_1, -e_1, \dots, e_n, -e_n\}$$

of the vectors of the standard orthonormal basis and their negatives.

Now define an embedding $F : X \to C^n$. Let $F(v_k) := e_k$, $F(v_{-k}) := e_{-k}$, where $1 \leq k \leq m$, $F(v_k) := e_k$, and $k = m + 1, \dots, n$. Since F is defined for all of the vertices of X, it uniquely defines a simplicial (piecewise linear) mapping $F : X \to C^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then

$$F(Y) \subset C^m \subset \mathbb{R}^m = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_i = 0,\ i = m + 1, \dots, n\},$$

$F(A(y)) = -F(y)$ for all $y \in Y$ and

$$F(X \setminus Y) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}_+ := \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_{m+1} + \dots + x_n > 0\},$$

as required.

2. Let $X = M$ and $Y = \partial M$. Then it follows from **1** that there is an embedding $F : M \to \mathbb{R}^q_+$ with $F(\partial M) \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ and $F(A(y)) = -F(y)$ for all $y \in \partial M$, where $q = n - 1$. Let

$$\tilde{M} := F(M) \cup (-F(M)) \subset \mathbb{R}^{q+1} = \mathbb{R}^q_+ \cup (-\mathbb{R}^q_+) \text{ and } \tilde{A}(x) := -x \text{ for all } x \in \tilde{M}.$$

It is clear that $\tilde{M} \simeq (N \setminus \partial N) \cup \partial N \cup \tilde{A}(N \setminus \partial N)$, where $N := F(M)$.

3. Let us prove that $(\tilde{M}, \tilde{A})$ is BUT. Indeed, since $(\partial M, A)$ is BUT, there is a continuous antipodal transversal to zeros mapping $g : \partial M \simeq \partial N \to \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ with $|Z_g| = 4m + 2$, where $d := \dim M$. We extend this mapping to $h : \tilde{M} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ with $h|_{\partial N} = g$ and $|Z_h| = |Z_g| = 4m+2$.

Let $v = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vertex of $\tilde{M}$. If $v \in \partial N$, then put

$$h(v) := (g(v), 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

For $v \in \tilde{M} \setminus \partial N$ define

$$h(v) := (0, \ldots, 0, x_{m+1} + \ldots + x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then $h : \tilde{M} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ is an antipodal transversal to zeros mapping and $h^{-1}(0) = g^{-1}(0)$. □

Theorem 3.3. *Let M be a d–dimensional compact PL manifold with boundary ∂M. Suppose $(\partial M, A)$ is a BUT–manifold. Let T be a triangulation of M that antipodally symmetric on ∂M. Let $L : V(T) \to \Pi_d$ be a labelling of T that is antipodal on the boundary. Then there is a complementary edge in T.*

Theorem 3.4. *Let M be a d–dimensional compact PL manifold with boundary ∂M. Suppose $(\partial M, A)$ is a BUT–manifold. Let T be a triangulation of M that antipodally symmetric on ∂M. Let $L : V(T) \to \Pi_{d+1}$ be a labelling of T that is antipodal on the boundary and has no complementary edges. Then for any set of labels $\Lambda := \{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_{d+1}\} \subset \Pi_{d+1}$ with $|\ell_i| = i$ for all i, the number of d–simplices in T that are labelled by Λ or $(-\Lambda)$ is odd.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 there is a BUT–manifold $(\tilde{M}, \tilde{A})$ that is the double of M. We can extend T and L from M to an antipodal triangulation $\tilde{T} := T \cup \tilde{A}(T)$ of $\tilde{M}$ and an antipodal labelling $\tilde{L} : V(\tilde{T}) \to \Pi_n$, where $n = d$ in Theorem 3.3 and $n = d + 1$ in Theorem 3.4, such that $\tilde{L}|_T = L$.

Thus, for the case $n = d$ Theorem 3.3 follows from Theorem 3.1 and for $n = d + 1$ Theorem 3.2 yields Theorem 3.4. □

4 Shashkin's proof of Tucker's theorems

In this section we consider two Tucker's theorems about covering families. Note that Tucker [16] obtained these theorem only for $\mathbb{S}^2$. Bacon [1] proved that statements in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 are equivalent to the Borsuk–Ulam theorem for normal topological spaces X with free

continuous involutions $A : X \to X$. (See also Theorem 2.1 in our paper [9].) Actually, these theorems can be proved from properties of Schwarz's genus [15] or Yang's cohomological index [4, 9].

For the two–dimensional case in the book [14] Shashkin derives Tucker's theorems from his lemma. Here we extend his proof for BUT–manifolds of all dimensions.

Theorem 4.1. *Let (M, A) be a d-dimensional BUT–manifold. Consider a family of closed sets $\{B_i, B_{-i}\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, d+1$, where $B_{-i} := A(B_i)$, is such that $B_i \cap B_{-i} = \emptyset$ for all i. If this family covers M, then for any set of indices $\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_{d+1}\} \subset \Pi_{d+1}$ with $|k_i| = i$ for all i, the intersection of all B_{k_i} is not empty.*

Proof. Note that any PL manifold admits a metric. For a triangulation T of M, the norm of T, denoted by $|T|$, is the diameter of the largest simplex in T.

Let $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of antipodal triangulations of M such that $|T_i| \to 0$. Now for all i define an antipodal labelling $L_i : V(T_i) \to \Pi_{d+1}$. For every $v \in V(T_i) \subset M$ set

$$L_i(v) := \ell, \text{ where } v \in B_\ell \text{ and } |\ell| = \min\{|k| : v \in B_k\}.$$

Then L_i satisfies the assumptions in Theorem 3.2 and T_i contains a simplex s_i with labels $\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_{d+1}\} \subset \Pi_{d+1}$.

Since M is compact and $|s_i| \to 0$, the sequence $\{s_i\}$ contains a converging subsequence P with limit $w \in M$. Then for $s_i \in P$ we have $V(s_i) \to w$.

By assumption, all B_k are closed sets. Therefore $w \in B_{k_j}$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, d+1$, and thus $w \in \cap_j B_{k_j}$. □

Theorem 4.2. *Let (M, A) be a d-dimensional BUT–manifold. Suppose that M is covered by a family $\mathcal{F}$ of $d+2$ closed subsets $C_1, \ldots, C_{d+2}$. Suppose that all C_i have no antipodal pairs $(x, A(x))$, in other words, $C_i \cap A(C_i) = \emptyset$. Let $0 < k < d+2$. Then any k subsets from $\mathcal{F}$ intersect and there is a point x in this intersection such that $A(x)$ belongs to the intersection of the remaining $(d+2-k)$ subsets in $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $k \geq (d+2)/2$ and that the k subsets from $\mathcal{F}$ are $C_1, \ldots, C_k$. Therefore, we have to prove that there is $x \in M$ such that

$$x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{k} C_i \quad \text{and} \quad A(x) \in \bigcap_{i=k+1}^{d+2} C_i$$

Set $C_{-i} := A(C_i)$. Let $m := \lceil d/2 \rceil$,

$$B_1 := C_1 \cap (C_{-2} \cup \ldots \cup C_{-(m+1)} \cup C_{-(d+2)}),$$

$$B_2 := C_2 \cap (C_{-3} \cup \ldots \cup C_{-(m+2)} \cup C_{-(d+2)}),$$

$$\vdots$$

$$B_d := C_d \cap (C_{-(d+1)} \cup C_{-1} \cup \ldots \cup C_{-(m-1)} \cup C_{-(d+2)}),$$
$$B_{d+1} := C_{d+1} \cap (C_{-1} \cup \ldots \cup C_{-m} \cup C_{-(d+2)}).$$

If $B_{-i} := A(B_i)$, then

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{d+1} B_i \cup B_{-i} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{d+2} C_i \cap (C_1 \cup \ldots \cup C_{d+2}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{d+2} C_i \cap M = \bigcup_{i=1}^{d+2} C_i = M.$$

On the other hand, $B_i \subset C_i$ and $B_{-i} \subset C_{-i}$, hence $B_i \cap B_{-i} = \emptyset$. Therefore, the family of subsets $\{B_i\}$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4.1. It follows that

$$Q := B_1 \cap \ldots \cap B_k \cap B_{-(k+1)} \cap \ldots \cap B_{-(d+1)} \neq \emptyset.$$

Let $x \in Q$. Then

$$x \in C_1 \cap \ldots \cap C_k \text{ and } A(x) \in C_{-(k+1)} \cap \ldots \cap C_{-(d+1)}.$$

Since $k \geq m+1$ and $x \in B_1 = C_1 \cap (C_{-2} \cup \ldots \cup C_{-(m+1)} \cup C_{-(d+2)})$, we have $x \in C_{-(d+2)}$, i.e. $A(x) \in C_{d+2}$. □

Corollary 4.1. *Let (M, A) be a d-dimensional BUT–manifold. Then M cannot be covered by $d+1$ closed sets, none containing a pair $(x, A(x))$ of antipodal points.*

Note that the case $M = \mathbb{S}^d$ was first considered by Lusternik and Schnirelmann in 1930.

Proof. Suppose the converse, so M can be covered by closed subsets $C_1, \ldots, C_{d+1}$.

Let $C_{d+2} := C_1$. Then this covering satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4.2. So there is x such that

$$x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{d+1} C_i \text{ and } A(x) \in C_{d+2}, \text{ i.e. } (x, A(x)) \in C_1,$$

a contradiction. □

Acknowledgment. I wish to thank Frédéric Meunier for helpful discussions and comments.

References

[1] P. Bacon, Equivalent formulations of the Borsuk-Ulam theorem, *Canad. J. Math.,* **18** (1966), 492–502.

[2] P. E. Conner and E. E. Floyd, Fixed points free involutions and equivariant maps, *Bull. Amer. Mat. Soc.,* **60** (1960), 416-441.

[3] K. Fan, A generalization of Tucker's combinatorial lemma with topological applications. *Ann. of Math.,* **56** (1952), 431-437.

[4] R. N. Karasev, Theorems of Borsuk-Ulam type for flats and common transversals of families of convex compact sets, *Sb. Math.,* **200** (2009), 1453–1471.

[5] J. Matoušek, Using the Borsuk-Ulam theorem, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.

[6] J. W. Milnor, Topology from the differentiable viewpoint, The University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1969.

[7] O. R. Musin, Borsuk-Ulam type theorems for manifolds, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **140** (2012), 2551-2560.

[8] O. R. Musin, Extensions of Sperner and Tucker's lemma for manifolds, *J. of Combin. Theory Ser. A,* **132** (2015), 172–187.

[9] O. R. Musin and A. Yu. Volovikov, Borsuk–Ulam Type spaces, *Mosc. Math. J.,* **15:4** (2015), 749–766.

[10] Yu. A. Shashkin, Fixed Points, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1991.

[11] Yu. A. Shashkin, Local degrees of simplicial mappings, *Publ. Math. Debrecen*, **45** (1994), 407–413.

[12] Yu. A. Shashkin, Remark on local degrees of simplicial mappings, *Publ. Math. Debrecen*, **49** (1996), 301–304.

[13] Yu. A. Shashkin, Variants of Tucker's combinatorial lemma, *Proc. IMM UrB of RAS*, **4** (1996), 127–132 (in Russian).

[14] Yu. A. Shashkin, Combinatorial lemmas and simplicial mappings, Ural State University press, Yekaterinburg, 1999 (in Russian).

[15] A. S. Švarc, The genus of a fiber space, *Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obsc.,* **10** (1961), 217-272 and **11** (1962), 99-126; (Russian), English translation in *Amer. Math. Soc. Translat.,* II. Ser., **55** (1966), 49–140.

[16] A. W. Tucker, Some topological properties of the disk and sphere. In: Proc. of the First Canadian Math. Congress, Montreal, 285-309, 1945.

O. R. Musin
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, School of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, One West University Boulevard, Brownsville, TX, 78520
E-mail address: oleg.musin@utrgv.edu